U.S. Pat. App. Ser. No. 10/561,566 Attorney Docket No. 10191/4903 Reply to Quayle Office Action of June 1, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 21 to 42 are pending. Claims 21 to 30 and 32 to 42 are allowed, and claim 31 was objected to (the summary wrongly refers to claim 33 as being objected to) as depending from canceled claim 3.

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 21 to 30 and 32 to 42.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

The Substitute Specification has been amended as suggested by deleting the sentence at line 4 of page 12 ("The invention is also not limited to the potential applications cited."). Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

As suggested, claim 31 has been amended without prejudice to depend from claim 21, since claim 3 was previously canceled.

Accordingly, claim 31 is allowable -- like allowed claims 21 30 and 32 to 42, so that the present application is in condition for allowance.

U.S. Pat. App. Ser. No. 10/561,566 Attorney Docket No. 10191/4903 Reply to Quayle Office Action of June 1, 2007

Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 31 is allowable -- like allowed claims 21 30 and 32 to 42. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn, since all issues raised have been addressed and obviated. An early and favorable action on the merits is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

By:

Gerard A. Messina

Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLI

One Broadway

New York, New York 10004

(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646